

REMARKS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his quick reply to the After Final response filed heretofore. Upon careful review and consideration of the Examiner's remarks, the Applicants respectfully maintain that the Kim reference cannot be combined with the Clark reference for at least the following reasons.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner agrees with the Applicants that, "Kim teaches the outputting of only digital signal, therefore can only be displayed on a digital display device..." and therefore Kim can only be used with digital display devices. In spite of this admission, however, the Examiner still maintains that the Kim reference can be combined with the Clark reference even though the Clark reference teaches both analog and digital displays without restriction. The Examiner states that Clark "clearly teaches that preference of the type of monitor (digital or analog) may be desired for utilization depending on certain environment, more specifically, for applications such as CAD, video editing, and financial applications, an analog display (CRT) is preferred...". However since the Examiner has admitted that Kim only teaches digital displays and Clark teaches both analog and digital displays without any restriction whatsoever, then the Applicants believe that the proposed combination of Kim and Clark would render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose in contradiction to MPEP 2143.01 V. The Applicants base this belief, in part, on the admission that Kim only teaches digital displays (analog displays are precluded) and therefore, by combining Kim and Clark, the entire purpose of Clark has been rendered unsatisfactory for its intended purpose (determining whether a monitor is digital or analog in nature).

Furthermore, the Applicants believe that the combination of Kim and Clark changes the principle of operation of at least Kim in contradiction of MPEP 2143.01 VI. Since Kim is strictly limited to ascertaining if a connector on a digital display device should be configured as a DVI-D (digital source) or DVI-A (analog source) connector based upon a whether the source is analog or

digital, Kim would have to contemplate analog displays if combined with Clark in contradiction of the Examiner's previous admission.

Accordingly, the Applicants reiterate their earlier argument that the Kim reference cannot be combined with the Clark reference and therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness type rejections of the pending claims based upon these references.

All remaining dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 8 and 15 and are also believed to be allowable.

Therefore, the Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300